HEALTH AND WELFARE

March 3, 1966

• (12: 20 p.m.)

Another thing, we are faced with a ridiculous situation. Take the war. If I am not mistaken the Canadian army represented Canada abroad, all over the world. The Canadian army used to give contraceptives as part of the kit during the last war. So Canada itself was breaking its own Criminal Code. Let us not face any more ridiculous situations like that. I have here a clipping from the Ottawa *Citizen* denouncing the hypocrasy of the federal government for failing to put out of business places distributing birth control literature. They also refer to contraceptives and contraception and I think we, as a group here, responsible for legislation should do something about this; otherwise the federal government will be faced with a further charge of hypocrisy for failing to abolish crazy legislation.

Mr. ENNIS: I appreciate the comments Dr. Isabelle has made. Earlier, Mr. Stanbury and Mr. Chatterton were in an exchange over the method of dispensation of contraceptive items, and I think there was some suggestion by you, Mr. Stanbury, that this should only be done by prescription at the pharmacies. I would trust that you would not include all items of contraceptives.

Mr. STANBURY: I think I said certain items.

Mr. ENNS: Because the whole question of illegitimacy might be affected if this were strongly restricted.

Mr. STANBURY: My concern here is to protect people from devices which could be dangerous without medical advice. I might say, Mr. Chairman, on this subject, just to clarify what has been said previously, that the coroner's jury which reported on a death of a girl at Glen Williams, Ontario—and I think this was the case referred to by a previous witness—recommended that the Criminal Code be amended so that information on birth control may be made available through the proper health authorities, legally. I think, too, sometimes there tends to be a generalization of the simplification of the recommendations of various groups on this subject. I think it is interesting to note the exact wording, for instance, of the resolution by the Canadian Council of Churches, not that it is necessarily an authority on the subject, but that resolution reads:

Be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Churches respectfully call upon the government of Canada to amend the Criminal Code in such a way as to make legal the dispensing of information and means, under competent medical or other professional guidance, so as to enable spouses, irrespective of their economic circumstances, who wish, in keeping with their religious convictions, to exercise their freedom in planning and spacing their families in accordance with their physical and economic means, to do so without adequate knowledge and instruction.

I am sure we will want to look at the specific recommendations of various groups like this, but we cannot simply say that all these groups have recommended the elimination of this provision from the code. I think that is perhaps simplifying the matter a little too much.

Mr. CHATTERTON: You said you approved of the idea of the dispensation by pharmacists of certain devices. Then, for instance, the pharmacists could still sell, for instance, condoms?

Mr. STANBURY: Well, this may still be legal.